Serial No. 09/811,660
March 24, 2003
Page 9

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (U.S. 5,424,602). In addition, claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. in view of Onishi et al. (JP 2000-216450). And finally, claims 4-6, 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. in view of Kawada (U.S. 3,778,648).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> **"A method for selecting a piezoelectric transformer having a desired characteristic which is performed in a method of manufacturing a piezoelectric transformer,** comprising the steps of:
> connecting a primary-side driving section of a piezoelectric transformer to a high-frequency generator while leaving a secondary-side generating section thereof in an open state;
> causing said high-frequency generator to sequentially generate and sweep a high-frequency signal over a predetermined frequency range;
> **measuring a resonant frequency of an input-impedance-versus-frequency characteristic of the piezoelectric transformer;**
> **selecting the piezoelectric transformer if said piezoelectric transformer has a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency; and**
> **rejecting the piezoelectric transformer if the piezoelectric transformer does not have a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency."** (emphasis added)

Claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22 recite method steps that are similar to the method steps recited in claim 1, including the emphasized method steps.

The Examiner alleged that Sato teaches a method of selecting a piezoelectric transformer characteristic including all of the method steps recited in claim 1, including a step of "selecting the characteristic (e.g. 1.38 ohms or 4.83 MHz, respectively) of the piezoelectric transformer (TR) based on the value of the measured resonant frequency." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Col. 22, line 58 through col. 23, line 2 of Sato et al., which the Examiner alleged

Serial No. 09/811,660
March 24, 2003
Page 10

teaches the method recited in claim 1, merely discloses that "FIGS. 38(A) - 38(D) show the detailed input impedance-frequency characteristic of the piezoelectric transformer of the present embodiment, wherein FIG. 38(A) shows the characteristic curve for the case where the output terminals T_2 and T_3 of the transformer defined in FIG 37(C) are shorted while FIG. 38(B) shows the characteristic curve for the case where no load is connected across the output terminals T_2 and T_3. On the other hand, FIG 38(C) shows the case where the input a.c. current is supplied to the terminals T_2 and T_3 while the terminals T_1 and T_3 are shorted. Further, FIG. 38(D) shows the case similar to FIG. 38(C) except that no load is connected across the terminals T_2 and T_3."

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Sato et al. fails to teach or suggest **any** method of selecting a piezoelectric transformer. In contrast, Sato et al. merely measures the characteristics of the piezoelectric transformer according to preferred embodiments of the invention of Sato et al. under two different conditions, e.g. where the output terminals are shorted and where no load is connected across the output terminals.

Sato et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest that a piezoelectric transformer is selected or rejected based upon whether the piezoelectric transformer has a desired characteristic, and certainly fails to teach or suggest the steps of "measuring a resonant frequency of an input-impedance-versus-frequency characteristic of the piezoelectric transformer," "selecting the piezoelectric transformer if said piezoelectric transformer has a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency" and "rejecting the piezoelectric transformers if the piezoelectric transformer does not have a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency" as recited in the present claimed invention.

In addition, the measurement of the characteristics of the piezoelectric transformer TR of Sato et al. is clearly performed **after** the manufacture of the piezoelectric transformer TR is completed, **NOT** in a method of manufacturing a piezoelectric transformer. Thus, Sato et al. fails to teach or suggest "a method for selecting a piezoelectric transformer having a desired characteristic which is performed in a method of manufacturing a piezoelectric transformer" as recited in the present

Serial No. 09/811,660
March 24, 2003
Page 11

claimed invention.

In fact, the measurement of the characteristics of the piezoelectric transformer TR of Sato et al. was performed merely to illustrate that the piezoelectric transformer of Sato et al. has improved characteristics as compared to a piezoelectric transformer according to the prior art, and clearly is **NOT** performed for the purposed of selecting or rejecting piezoelectric transformers based on whether the piezoelectric transformer has a desired characteristic as recited in the present claimed invention.

Onishi et al. and Kawada are relied upon merely to teach a step of measuring the bandwidth of an input-impedance-versus-frequency characteristic, and certainly fails to teach or suggest "a method for selecting a piezoelectric transformer having a desired characteristic which is performed in a method of manufacturing a piezoelectric transformer" including the steps of "measuring a resonant frequency of an input-impedance-versus-frequency characteristic of the piezoelectric transformer," "selecting the piezoelectric transformer if said piezoelectric transformer has a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency" and "rejecting the piezoelectric transformers if the piezoelectric transformer does not have a desired characteristic based on the value of the measured resonant frequency" as recited in the present claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sato et al., Onishi et al. and Kawada, applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination of method steps recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22 are allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 depend upon claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19 and 22 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 09/811,660
March 24, 2003
Page 12

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-Month extension of time, extending to March 24, 2003, the period for response to the Office Action dated October 23, 2002.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2003

Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080

FAX RECEIVED

MAR 2 4 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800